

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

It is beyond reprehensible that Sinclair could use the public airwaves, free of charge, to serve their own corporate/political interest. How is the public interest served in this case? Not at all. The FCC has an obligation to represent the public interest and should act to do so in this case.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.